



18 APR 2005

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Westerman, Hattori, Daniels & Adrian, LLP
Suite 700
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

In re Application of	:	
JIN et al.	:	
U.S. Application No. 10/501,452	:	DECISION ON PETITION
PCT No.: PCT/JP03/00252	:	
Int. Filing Date: 15 January 2003	:	
Priority Date: 15 January 2002	:	
Attorney Docket No.: 042586	:	
For: SOLVENT-SOLUBLE BLOCK	:	
COPOLYMERIZATION POLYIMIDE	:	
COMPOSITION, AND ITS	:	
PRODUCTION PROCESS	:	

This decision is in response to applicants' "Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 11 March 2005 to accept the application without the signature of joint-inventor, Akihito Taniguchi. The petition fee has been submitted.

BACKGROUND

On 15 January 2003, applicants filed international application PCT/JP03/00252 which claimed a priority date of 15 January 2002. A copy of the international application was communicated to the United States Patent and Trademark Office from the International Bureau on 24 July 2003. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.495, the deadline for payment of the basic national fee in the United States was to expire 30 months from the international filing date, 15 July 2004.

On 14 July 2004, applicants filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1); international search report; and a translation of the international application.

On 13 September 2004, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed. The notification set a two-month time limit in which to respond.

On 04 November 2004, applicants filed a declaration executed by five of the six joint-inventors.

On 22 November 2004, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Defective Response (Form PCT/DO/EO/916) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed.

On 11 March 2005, applicants filed the present petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) and three-month extension of time.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17, (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the nonsigning joint inventor. Items (1) and (4) have been satisfied.

Regarding item (2) above, petitioner states that Akihito Taniguchi has refused to sign the application. Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

A review of the present petition and the accompanying papers reveal that applicants have not satisfied the item (2) above, in that the applicants have not shown that a bona fide attempt was made to present the application papers, including the specification, claims, and drawings to Akihito Taniguchi. Mr. Koizumi has provided a declaration outlining the efforts to reach Akihito Taniguchi. However, the statements made with regards to the efforts to reach Mr. Taniguchi constitutes secondhand knowledge, at best, in that the majority of the actions to which applicants are averring to were conducted by Akira Yonezawa and Seibi Inoue. Therefore, petitioner has not provided sufficient proof that the inventor refuses to execute the application.

As stated above, where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, a statement of facts is needed from a person having first hand knowledge of the facts that a complete copy of the application papers (specification, claims, and drawings) were sent to Mr. Taniguchi, and when such papers were sent. In addition, copies of documentary evidence such as a certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instruction, telegrams, etc., should be supplied with the declaration.

Regarding item (3) above, petitioner has not provided a clear statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventor. See M.P.E.P. 409.03(e).

For the reasons stated above, it would not be appropriate to accept the application without the signature of Akihito Taniguchi under 37 CFR 1.47(a) at this time:

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTH** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to: Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration
Telephone: (571) 272-3298
Facsimile: (571) 273-0459